UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2532nd MEETING: 3 MAY 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2532) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Cyprus:
Letter dated 30 April 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16514) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2532nd MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 3 May 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2532)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Cyprus:
   Letter dated 30 April 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16514)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Cyprus:
Letter dated 30 April 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Cyprus to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16514)

1. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2531st meeting I invite the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Iacovou (Cyprus), Mr. Dountas (Greece) and Mr. Kirca (Turkey) took places at the Council table; Mr. Jacobs (Antigua and Barbuda) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Afghanistan in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Antigua and Barbuda. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. JACOBS (Antigua and Barbuda): Mr. President, may I offer you my congratulations on your assumption of your important position and say that I am confident that your skill, charm and experience will no doubt assist you in guiding the deliberations of this body successfully.

5. I have asked to speak in this debate on Cyprus because my Government considers it of paramount importance that the world community fully understand that small countries, such as Antigua and Barbuda, view the circumstances of Cyprus with grave concern.

6. The invasion of Cyprus in 1974 by Turkey and the occupation of 37 per cent of its territory was in itself an act of utter disregard for the principles of international law and the traditions of international practice. But Turkey added international insult to global injury when it ignored General Assembly and Security Council resolutions calling upon it to withdraw from Cypriot territory. Over the years Turkey has challenged the effectiveness of this Organization by treating its resolutions with contempt while tightening its stranglehold on Cyprus by exporting its own Turkish citizens to Cyprus, by illegally distributing houses and lands owned by expelled Greek Cypriots and by imposing its own currency as legal tender in that part of Cyprus which it continues to occupy.

7. In an attempt to encourage a solution to the Cyprus problem, many countries turned a blind eye to these excesses by Turkey in the hope that intercommunal talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots would produce a viable framework for the stable and peaceful development of all the Cypriot people in the context of

secure national independence. Alas, this was not to be, and a principal contributor to the failure of these intercommunal talks was the continued presence of Turkish forces on Cypriot soil, for, as I had occasion to remark in the General Assembly last year, "No people can reach a lasting solution to their internal problems if external forces exert undue influence on one side or the other."

8. On 15 November last year, even as the nations of the world were looking forward to a winter of progress in renewed intercommunal talks following last spring's serious attempt by the United Nations to establish a framework to settle the Cyprus problem, the Turkish Cypriot leadership shocked us all by declaring occupied Cyprus an independent State. I can think of no words that more graphically describe this act than those used by the Cypriot President when he addressed the General Assembly one week after this disturbing development. He said:

> "The bogus entity set up by Turkey in the occupied area has ... legally no territory except the territory controlled by the Turkish occupation troops. It is therefore the offspring of aggression and the result of a continuing criminality".[1]

9. The Security Council recognized that the attempt to create a "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" was invalid and contributed to a worsening of the situation in Cyprus. On 18 November, just three days after the unilateral declaration of independence, the Council adopted resolution 541 (1983), which deplored the declaration of the Turkish Cypriot authorities of the purported secession of part of the Republic of Cyprus. Within a week the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting at New Delhi denounced the declaration as legally invalid and reiterated the call for its non-recognition and immediate withdrawal. The European Economic Community, at the level of the Council of Ministers, last month repeated its condemnation of the unilateral declaration of independence and went on to express its regret that Turkey had decided to accord recognition to this illegal entity.

10. World opinion on this matter has seldom spoken with a more unified voice. The people of the world are tired of strong-arm tactics by the big over the small. They are fed up with continuous violations of international principles and practices. They are disturbed at the spectre of global chaos which such behaviour portends. It is crystal clear that the leadership of the Turkish Cypriots is being told that the world will not accept the unilateral declaration of independence. It is crystal clear that the Government of Turkey is being told not to encourage and protect such a flagrant violation of international law.

11. The Secretary-General has laboured hard and long on this matter, and he deserves the admiration of us all for his tireless toil in a vineyard which has offered few fruits. It is right that the Security Council should request that he redouble his efforts, for there have been some encouraging signs. The public statement of the Cypriot Government and the concessions that it is prepared to make offer at least an opportunity on which to build. But the Council must not be content merely once again to throw the Secretary-General to the wolves. He must enter the arena clothed in some armour against those who would make light of grave international injustice. In this context the Council must now call for effective sanctions against the bogus Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and equally, it should urge sanctions against those States which would seek to give comfort and relief to the illegal Government.

12. It may appear that the problems of Cyprus should hold little concern for a Caribbean island separated from it by so many oceans. But that perception would be wrong, for injustice is real, however far away it may be perpetrated, and illegality remains illegal, whatever the distance of its occurrence. In these circumstances the people of Cyprus share a common bond with the people of the world, and every man has a sacred duty to safeguard that bond. But my country is also a small island State, like Cyprus. We too are vulnerable to the adventures of larger and more powerful States. Therefore, in calling for justice to be done in Cyprus we are doing no more than calling for justice for all small and vulnerable States, such as our own.

13. We are reminded of the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., who said in another context, but with equal compulsion: "A threat to justice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." We look to the United Nations for such justice. We look in particular to the Security Council. In this context we urge that it act for the legitimate State of Cyprus and, by so doing, act for the world.

14. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey.

15. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey) [*interpretation from French*]: At the beginning of my statement permit me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. Personally I hold you in great respect. You are one of the most capable and pleasant personalities it has been my honour and pleasure to encounter in the course of my career. Furthermore, I wish to reiterate publicly at this time that my Government attaches primary importance to its policy of good-neighbourliness in relations between our two countries. I should also like to congratulate the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Vladimir Alekseyevich Kravets, who so skilfully guided the Council's work last month.

16. Before I come to the substantive part of my statement I should like to declare, on the express instructions of my Government, that Turkey has serious reservations with regard to the Secretary-General's report of 1 May 1984 [*S/16519*] as a whole, as well as on certain passages therein. However, out of deference to him and

to his mission of good offices, my Government prefers to discuss the matter with him through the normal diplomatic channels.

17. The Security Council is meeting once again to discuss the question of the independence of the Turkish State of Cyprus at the request of the Greek Cypriot administration.

18. On 17 and 18 November last year [*2498th and 2500th meetings*] I had the opportunity to express the views of my Government on the question. At that time my Government informed the Council of its decision to reject resolution 541 (1983) in its entirety and of its desire to continue recognizing the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The reasons behind this are very simple and I shall, with the Council's permission, set them forth briefly.

19. Following a series of unilateral actions, towards the end of 1963 the Greek Cypriot community overthrew the legislative, executive and judicial organs of the Republic of Cyprus as they had been established in the unalterable Basic Articles of the 16 August 1960 Constitution, thus violating the Treaty of Guarantee[2] of the same date, for the purpose of robbing the Turkish community of the island of its status of co-founder of, and equal partner in, the Republic and relegating it to the position of a persecuted, exploited and dominated minority.

20. That *coup d'état* totally upset the political equilibrium that had been established between the Turkish community and the Greek community on the island. Never in the history of Cyprus has the Greek community obtained *de jure* or *de facto* the position of ruling majority *vis-à-vis* the Turkish community. There has never been either a majority or a minority in Cyprus. The historical truth is that two national and quite separate communities have continued to coexist on the island. Each one of these two communities is nothing but the extension of a nation whose spiritual identity and collective soul were forged throughout centuries of history. The very unusual context of relations between Turks and Hellenes has required and continues to require the establishment of a political equilibrium based on the idea of equality between the two nations—Turkish and Greek. When Turkish and Greek statesmen deserving of the name prepared and signed the 11 February 1959 Zurich Agreement[3] and, with the co-operation of the United Kingdom, the 19 February 1959 London Agreement,[3] they laid the foundations for that intercommunal equilibrium, just as the more general equilibrium between Turkey and Greece and the Turks and the Hellenes in that part of the world at the time had been established by the 24 July 1923 Lausanne Peace Treaty.[4] The Constitution and the Nicosia agreements of 16 August 1960 in fact only set down in detail the principles that had already been worked out between Turkey and Greece.

21. Hence it is only in that historical context that one can have a true picture of the question of Cyprus. And the question of Cyprus can be resolved only in the context of respect for the equality of the two great Turkish and Greek peoples, which must everywhere coexist peacefully in friendship, actively co-operate at all levels and together nurture this incredible wealth of common characteristics and values, finally burying all enmity, rivalry and squabbles inherited from the past.

22. Ever since the *coup d'état* of 1963 the Turkish Cypriot community has continued its struggle in order to regain its status as an equal partner in the Cypriot State, thanks to the unwavering support of Turkey.

23. As long as the attributes of that status are not restored and recognized as envisaged in the Treaty of Guarantee, the proclamation of independence of the Turkish cypriot community is perfectly justified on moral and juridical grounds based on the right to self-determination it has already exercised on an equal footing with the Greek community of the island, on the principle of self-defence and, lastly, on the principle according to which anyone whose rights are trampled upon may under international law resort to retaliation. Indeed, that act was not one of secession, since it was aimed only at reaffirming the equal status of the two communities and since it can be revoked once the two communities reach agreement, within a reasonable period of time, to restore and restructure the State organs of the Republic within the framework of a bicommunal and bi-zonal federation, as was stipulated in the high-level agreements of 12 February 1977 [*see S/12323, para. 5*] and 19 May 1979 [*see S/13369, para. 51*], agreements which were referred to in the Secretary-General's opening statement of 9 August 1980 [*S/14100, annex*]. Furthermore, at the political level that decision had become inescapable.

24. Intercommunal negotiations were resumed in September 1980. The Turkish Cypriot community then submitted a comprehensive plan. Later, it accepted the Secretary-General's "evaluation" paper of 18 November 1981 as being one of the major elements constituting the basis on which the talks should proceed.

25. During these negotiations, which could have continued regularly and in a serious manner geared to eventual success on this mutually agreed-upon basis —that is, the high-level agreements, the opening statement of the Secretary-General and the "evaluation" paper—the Greek Cypriot administration took advantage of every possible opportunity to interrupt and delay them, since the purpose of the Greek Cypriot administration and its constant accomplice, Greece, was to do away with the Secretary-General's opening statement and "evaluation" paper. On this point, I refer members of the Council to my letter of 9 May 1983, contained in document A/37/809, which faithfully reproduces the exact chronology of the negotiations.

26. To achieve that goal, the Greek Cypriot administration brought the matter to the General Assembly, in violation of its commitment under the high-level

agreements not to attempt to internationalize the problem. On 13 May 1983 the General Assembly adopted resolution 37/253, which the Turkish Cypriot community and Turkey immediately rejected *in toto*. That recommendation—a masterpiece of bias, distortion of historical truth, and disregard for the elementary rules of international law, in particular of the principle of the inviolability of treaties—exasperated the Turkish community.

27. At that point it became convinced that as long as it waited and refrained from restoring itself to a position of equal footing with the Greek Cypriot community there could be no chance of convincing the Greek Cypriot community to negotiate seriously with a view to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting solution. That is why it decided to declare its independence. Mr. Rauf Denktaş, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, has reiterated this once again: unless there is a final agreement on a federal solution, that decision is irrevocable. Also irrevocable is Turkey's decision to recognize the new State. Anyone who knows a bit about the Turkish people will know that its determination cannot be broken and that that people refuses to yield even an inch on problems concerning national honour, whatever the designs of those who would exert pressure; they will no doubt come to understand, as they have in the past, that their mistakes are equalled only by their ignorance.

28. On 18 November 1983, the Security Council, following the example of the General Assembly, adopted resolution 541 (1983), a biased, unjust and untimely resolution. How could it be expected that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and Turkey could come to terms with a recommendation which, on the basis of the Treaty of Guarantee, deplores the independence of the Turkish community? The Security Council, like the General Assembly and the majority of States Members, did not even remember that Treaty when, from late 1963, the Greek community was trampling on the Cypriot Constitution, which had been established and guaranteed by international treaties, when it was persecuting, plundering and massacring the Turkish community, or even when an internationally notorious murderer seized power on the island in 1974 with the assistance of Greece in order to achieve the island's final union with that country. How could they heed the representatives of States which are always ready to preach to one and all the primacy of the rule of law and to counsel moderation to the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot peoples when they themselves are responsible for having cast the Treaty of Guarantee into oblivion and for being the accomplices of the usurper, recognizing it as the legitimate Government of the Republic of Cyprus and recalling the Treaty only in order to deplore the Turkish community's cries of exasperation.

29. We are here again today because of amazement at the fact that the Turkish Cypriot community now has its own flag and its own national hymn and is about to have a new Constitution and to organize new elections. Why this excessive agitation? These are not even symbols specific to independence. After all, this meeting is taking place in a country where states of the federation, counties, municipalities and even administrative units have their own flags, and where it is usual for each of the states of the federation to have its own constitution. Indeed, the organization of elections is the duty of a democratic State which respects human rights. Why is there such emotion when the new State exchanges ambassadors with mine; this is a routine affair between States which recognize each other as such.

30. Apparently, the critics do not want the new Turkish State to consolidate its independence. But it will continue doing so, with the full support of the people and the Government of Turkey, and, as long as it requests it, under the protection of the Turkish armed forces.

31. Yet the new State has not failed to put forward very constructive proposals aimed at bringing the Greek community back to the intercommunal negotiating table; among them were those of 2 January and 18 April last. These proposals, unfortunately, received no positive response from those to whom they were made. In that connection, I wish also to state, on express instructions from my Government, that at no time has Turkey agreed to support or to encourage any proposals, ideas or suggestions other than those officially put forward by the competent authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

32. I wish also to stress another point: no pressure —whether by Governments or by parliaments—can break or bend the determination of the Turkish people to support their Cypriot brethren. Until they are renounced totally, these pressures, these "conditions", will, unfortunately, constitute a major obstacle in the quest for a final solution to the Cyprus question.

33. It is quite possible to convince the Turkish community not to establish its independence definitively. But that result cannot be achieved by pursuing a policy of ostracism and isolation against it; it already possesses a framework within which it can be secure and certain to be able to live in perfect happiness, proudly enjoying full national identity.

34. Those who wish to prevent the Turkish Cypriot community from progressing on the path of independence are taking the wrong approach. They ought rather to make it clear to the Greek Cypriot administration and to Greece that they hold the key to reopening the path to the re-integration of the Turkish community into the Cypriot fold. They must therefore consent to resume the intercommunal negotiations, without thereby implying that they recognize the independent Turkish Cypriot State, under the auspices of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General entrusted to him in paragraph 6 of Security Council resolution 367 (1975), "on a mutually agreed basis," which is the terminology used by the Secretary-General, with a

view to reaching a comprehensive settlement within the framework of a bicommunal, bi-zonal and non-aligned Cypriot federation based on the principle of equality between the two communities on the island, Turkish and Greek.

35. In this connection I should like to reiterate that my Government continues to support the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. My Government is also of the view that the interlocutors of the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about a resumption of the intercommunal negotiations are, within the context of his mission of good offices, as always the Turkish Cypriot community and the Greek Cypriot community.

36. Let the Greeks and the Greek Cypriots indulge themselves in their continual dream that one fine day the miracle they so desire will come to pass and that Turkey and with it the Turkish Cypriot community will succumb to one sort of pressure or another or even that Turkey will sink into such decadence that pan-Hellenism can once again attempt to invade the Turkish territories that are still labeled on official maps as "lost Hellenic provinces". If they can be satisfied by such ridiculous illusions, they can go on harbouring them for as long as they like, even to the end of time. It is up to wise and well-intentioned third-party Governments to do what is necessary to make them see reason and face up to realities, rather than pamper them in their insane dreams and allow them to remain bogged down in the unreality of their myths and fictions.

37. I repeat, there is no way other than intercommunal negotiation; there will be no final solution other than one that recognizes for the Turkish community of Cyprus its status as co-partner, on an equal footing, in a bicommunal, bi-zonal and non-aligned federation.

38. I reserve my right to speak again during the course of these discussions if I deem it necessary.

39. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The next speaker is the representative of Greece, upon whom I now call.

40. Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): I thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for acquiescing to my request to participate in this debate. Before embarking on the subject of my statement, I should like to congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the current month. Your vast experience and personal finesse and your sense of tact, as well as the fact of your speaking with the authority of the country you represent, constitute the grounds for our confidence that you will guide the deliberations of the Council with wisdom and efficiency. I would be remiss were I to fail at this stage to congratulate Mr. Kravets for the excellent manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the past month.

41. The Security Council is meeting again to deal once more with the almost perennial—unfortunately—question of Cyprus. The reasons for which the Council has dealt with the matter so many times in the past result from the threat of the use of force and the use of force proper by Turkey against the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus.

42. In his address this morning [*2531st meeting*] President Kyprianou presented a clear, balanced and honest picture of the situation in Cyprus and of the perspectives and possibilities for a fair solution. My Government fully endorses and supports the views expressed by the President of the Republic of Cyprus.

43. At this stage I should like to confine myself to a few remarks which reflect the basic philosophy of my Government with regard to the question of Cyprus and the situation this problem is creating in the entire region.

44. In flagrant violation of all norms of international law Turkey in July 1974 invaded the Republic of Cyprus. As to the Turkish contention that their invasion was based on the Treaty of Guarantee, this has been repeatedly rebutted with valid legal arguments such as those that appear, *inter alia*, in the records of the 2405th meeting, paragraphs 154 to 156. Under the dome of the Charter there is no room for military action against an independent sovereign State Member of this Organization.

45. Since that time the United Nations has deplored in numerous resolutions the continuing military occupation of part of the Republic of Cyprus. In his turn the Secretary-General has taken many initiatives in his indefatigable efforts towards bringing the parties together at the negotiating table. Unfortunately, those efforts have all failed because Turkey has been unshakeable in its position that a solution should be based on the principle of equal partnership in sovereignty over the Republic by the Greek and Turkish communities, which constitute respectively 80 and 18 per cent of the Cypriot population. Equally unshakeable has been Turkey's position that the Turkish community should control a territory twice the size of what its population ratio would justify. So Turkey plans to achieve both: territorially, the partitioning of the Republic of Cyprus and, constitutionally, the co-ownership of the whole of the Republic on a 50-50 basis by the two communities, one representing 80 per cent and the other 18 per cent of the population. Moreover, Ankara insists that the whole arrangement should be guaranteed by Turkey. Allow me to submit that if this were to happen the independent Republic of Cyprus would for all practical purposes be turned into a protectorate of Turkey. This would be the first step towards total subordination of the Republic to Turkey.

46. What has happened in Cyprus has, in our view, very little to do with intercommunal differences. It would indeed be inconceivable if minority communities were allowed to request the military intervention of foreign Powers in order to acquire disproportionate

status within a State. If this principle were to be accepted I am afraid that most of the States Members of the United Nations could be dismembered. If it were for the people of Cyprus to find a bicommunal balance within the framework of internationally accepted patterns, I do believe this goal could have been attained in a matter of a few weeks. However, the problem of Cyprus stems directly from Turkish expansionism in the eastern Mediterranean and the so-called geopolitical interest of Turkey in Cyprus. In view of this reality, whatever happens in the occupied part of the Republic of Cyprus is, we believe, the sole responsibility of the Government of Turkey because Ankara is the authority which totally controls militarily that part of the Republic.

47. So Turkey alone bears the responsibility for the unilateral declaration of independence of the Turkish Cypriot pseudo-State. Turkey has the sole responsibility for permitting the announcement of elections for its consolidation, an act which, *inter alia*, runs counter to the provisions of Security Council resolution 541 (1983). Turkey also bears the sole responsibility for the purported exchange of ambassadors, again an act violating that resolution. These acts by Turkey are not only in violation of the Charter and international law in general, and in particular of resolution 541 (1983), but are also a manifestation of disrespect for the Secretary-General's recent initiative aimed at bringing the parties together at the negotiating table.

48. The Secretary-General, who, understandably, is very cautious in his utterances, could not help saying in his recent report that he had authorized the following statement:

> "The Secretary-General deeply regrets the ceremonies"—the exchange of ambassadors—which took place today in northern Cyprus and Ankara, respectively. The Secretary-General has instructed his Special Representative, Mr. Hugo Gobbi, to transmit immediately to those involved his great concern over these developments, which have placed in jeopardy his current efforts." [*See S/16519, para. 20.*]

49. One could speak for hours and hours about the various aspects of the Cyprus problem. The only hope for a speaker is to address the common sense and experience of the representatives in the Security Council. It is in this spirit that I dare say that the omens are not favourable for the independence of Cyprus and for peace in the region. Turkey is acting with provocative arrogance, an outgrowth of its military might. It seems to us strange indeed that a country which relies heavily on foreign aid to maintain its military apparatus is permitted the luxury of spending more than $200 million a year to maintain its occupation force in the Republic of Cyprus, against international law and against the resolutions of the United Nations. I submit that this is a fact which should be of crucial concern to the countries that lend their support to the Turkish military machine.

50. President Kyprianou this morning made a genuine and honest appeal for a peaceful solution to the problem of Cyprus. On behalf of my Government I join in the appeal of the President of Cyprus to the Council to examine ways and means to help the Government of Cyprus to restore the exercise of the sovereignty of the State all over the Republic, because, as President Kyprianou said, what is at stake there is the very survival of an independent sovereign State Member of the United Nations, and to a great extent the hopes for the survival of the State rest with you—members of the Council.

51. My Government is deeply preoccupied by the continuation of the situation in Cyprus. We really believe that if the Council fails at this juncture to check the steadily increasing provocations and acts by Turkey against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, the options for a peaceful solution to the problem will dangerously shrink.

52. The Government of Cyprus has repeatedly stated that it is willing to participate in a fair compromise. However, what Turkey is asking for is an unconditional surrender, on the basis of its military might. This is a development that we shall never accept. In view of this situation, I should not be exaggerating in saying that Turkey, with its acts against Cyprus, is indeed endangering peace in the island, thus aggravating the situation in a region already overburdened with tensions and conflicts.

53. In this context I should like to express—I think it is appropriate—our deep appreciation of the mission of the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). This appreciation is addressed particularly to the States that contribute men and material to the maintenance of the Force. UNFICYP has proved to be an invaluable factor for the safeguard of peace in the island. I can say with a great degree of certainty that but for the presence of UNFICYP in Cyprus, peace would have been gravely endangered.

54. Before concluding I should like to refer to the famous theme of *enosis*—the union of Greece with Cyprus—on which the Turks have been harping for many years. On 18 October 1983, in reply to certain allegations of this nature by Turkey, I sent a letter to the Secretary-General which was circulated as document S/16079. I should like to quote from this letter, because it gives a definitive reply to the famous allegations that Greece is seeking *enosis* with Cyprus. The letter says:

> "It is a historical fact that, in the 1950s, the people of Cyprus were struggling for self-determination, the realization of which might have led to a union with Greece and that Greece had supported this anti-colonial struggle. In 1960, a historical compromise was reached, whereby a sovereign and independent Republic of Cyprus was established. The Greek Government has always adhered to this compromise, notwithstanding the initial reaction of a part of

Hellenic public opinion. This reaction has since completely subsided, and any reference to the goals of the anti-colonial struggle of the people of Cyprus during the 1950s is of a purely historical nature and can in no way be construed as constituting a policy statement. The people and the democratic Governments of Greece have genuinely accepted and have been unwaveringly supporting"—and will unwaveringly support—"the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus. If there is a country that is violating each and every one of these principles, it is Turkey, by its invasion of Cyprus in 1974 and by its continuing occupation of one third of the territory of the Republic."

Invoking the famous theme of *enosis* is like calling a shadow of the past into existence to justify the crimes of the present.

55. I trust that no matter what the Turks say they will fail to blur the fact that Turkish troops occupy part of the Republic of Cyprus, and that they will fail to refute that the question of Cyprus is one of foreign occupation of an independent, sovereign State Member of this Organization, which is why the question of Cyprus is brought before the Council.

56. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Allow me to state, at the very outset, how pleased my delegation is to see you, Sir, presiding over our deliberations. We congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Our two countries are bound by close ties of friendship and multidimensional co-operation. Your own personal charm, high competence and long and varied diplomatic experience are too well known and I do not need to dwell on them at any length. Those qualities shall surely stand us in good stead during the Council's consideration of urgent and critical issues. I extend to you, Mr. President, the wholehearted co-operation of my delegation in helping you discharge your onerous responsibilities. Permit me also to express a word of sincere appreciation to Mr. Vladimir Kravets of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for his very competent and dignified stewardship of the Council during the month of April.

57. Barely five and a half months ago the Security Council met to discuss the situation in Cyprus, in the wake of an event which caused shock and consternation the world over, namely, the unilateral proclamation of a so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. That action, which was denounced in most capitals of the world, infinitely complicated an already serious situation in Cyprus and caused a severe setback to the painstaking efforts, made over several years, by the Secretary-General to promote a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus question through intercommunal dialogue. At the time, my delegation spoke before the Council [*2498th meeting*] and I had occasion to express the profound shock and concern with which the Government of India had learnt of the unilateral declaration of independence. We deplored that action, which was in violation of the declarations of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the resolutions of the General Assembly on the question of Cyprus.

58. On 18 November 1983 the Security Council adopted resolution 541 (1983) in which, *inter alia*, the Council deplored the declaration of the Turkish Cypriot authorities of the purported secession of part of the Republic of Cyprus; considered the declaration to be legally invalid and called for its withdrawal; called upon all States not to recognize any Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus and requested the Secretary-General to pursue his mission of good offices in order to achieve the earliest possible progress towards a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus. The resolution further called upon all States and the two communities in Cyprus to refrain from any action which might exacerbate the situation and called upon the parties to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in his mission of good offices.

59. We had hoped that the almost-universal denunciation of the action taken by the Turkish Cypriot leadership and the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 541 (1983) would have made wiser counsels prevail and would have encouraged a process of restraint and reversal so that the grave situation already created would be alleviated. We were somewhat heartened to learn subsequently of the talks initiated under the auspices of the Secretary-General on the basis of ideas put forward by him to both sides in January of this year. We were hopeful that the willingness of both parties to undertake a fresh dialogue and the presentation of proposals by them would presage a reduction of tensions and an honest effort to work out a negotiated settlement which would, *inter alia*, involve as an indispensable element the freezing and eventual reversal of the unilateral action taken by the Turkish Cypriot side.

60. Against that background, it is particularly unfortunate and regrettable that further actions should have been taken by the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community in direct contravention of resolution 541 (1983) and the Secretary-General's endeavours. As we are all aware, on 10 April 1984 the Turkish Cypriot leaders announced that the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus intended to conduct a constitutional referendum in August and elections in November 1984. On 17 April ceremonies took place in Ankara and Nicosia which were publicly described as constituting the submission of "credentials" for the establishment of diplomatic relations between Turkey and the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Those actions —not to mention other steps such as the adoption of a separate flag, anthem, etc.—flew directly in the face of the provisions of resolution 541 (1983) and of the Secretary-General's call to "freeze" the unilateral declaration of independence. As the Secretary-General himself observed, those actions placed in jeopardy his current efforts.

61. My delegation has listened with great attention to the address delivered this morning before the Security

Council by the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Spyros Kyprianou. President Kyprianou has presented his country's case before the Council in poignantly lucid terms. Having listened to his statement, we are able to appreciate to an even greater extent how critical are the circumstances that confront Cyprus today. The unity, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of a Member State of the United Nations are under serious threat. Fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and espoused by the Non-Aligned Movement are at stake.

62. President Kyprianou has warned us that, if the process set in motion last November is not reversed, the partition of Cyprus will become inevitable and Cyprus as a unified island entity will cease to exist; the responsibility for this would rest squarely with this Council and especially its permanent members. His urgent appeal to the conscience of the world community cannot go unheeded. We must and shall come forward with an adequate response.

63. I have listened with care to the statements made by other representatives today. I have also followed with close attention the statement made to the Council by Mr. Denktaş, as representative of the Turkish Cypriot community. My delegation has always advocated that the legitimate rights of the Turkish Cypriot community should be respected and defended. However, we do not see any force in the arguments advanced to justify the series of illegal and unacceptable actions taken. We have always believed that the Cyprus question needs to be resolved in a peaceful manner and without delay. An equitable solution has to be found by which the people of Cyprus, Greek and Turkish alike, as partners sharing a common destiny, can live in dignity, with equal rights and in friendship and harmony in an undivided country. We have consistently pointed to intercommunal negotiations as the only possible means towards this end. Nevertheless, the actions taken over the past six months by the Turkish Cypriot community, in spite of professions to the contrary, can in no way promote such negotiations; indeed they have served only to bring them to a complete halt.

64. It is true that the negotiations have been long and protracted, often frustrating and frequently stalemated. This is not surprising, given the history and complexity of the problem and the deep-seated suspicions and mistrust which have grown over the years. But the way to stimulate these negotiations is not by creating conditions which make the continuation of the negotiations impossible. If the dialogue is to be revitalized, surely it can be done only by renewed commitment and not by actions and measures leading to a division of the country which would render further talks irrelevant.

65. To make a unilateral declaration of independence and to take steps which are claimed to be "in implementation of the natural and legal consequences" of that declaration is to destroy the very basis on which the dialogue is predicated. We have taken due note of Mr. Denktaş's assurance to the Council that he is not seeking the partition of the country, but the course that he has now taken would appear to go just in that direction.

66. The report of the Secretary-General contained in document S/16519 describes the efforts he has made in pursuance of the resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 541 (1983). As the Secretary-General himself has stated in his report, "The developments outlined in this report speak for themselves". The exchange of correspondence annexed to the report is revealing. It is clear that the Turkish Cypriot community's response and actions have created a complete deadlock, thereby threatening the very process of communication and negotiations which the Secretary-General has been trying to reactivate and which he has emphasized in his report. On the other hand, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus has, in spite of extreme provocation, demonstrated its continued willingness to undertake meaningful negotiations.

67. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has always reiterated its full solidarity with and support for the people and Government of the Republic of Cyprus and reaffirmed its respect for that country's independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment. At their Seventh Conference, held at New Delhi in March 1983, the heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries stated, *inter alia*, that "the *de facto* situation created by the force of arms and unilateral actions should not in any way affect the solution of the problem" [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, sect. I, para. 130*]. What was actually happened is a succession of attempts to create *de facto* situations which are unacceptable to the international community.

68. Immediately after the unilateral declaration of independence by the Turkish Cypriot community on 15 November 1983, the Prime Minister of India and Chairperson of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, addressed a special message on the subject to heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries. I should like to quote from that message:

> "This unilateral declaration undermines the unity of Cyprus, violates its territorial integrity, transgresses its sovereignty, calls into question its independence and puts in jeopardy the non-aligned status of the island as a whole.
>
> "The Non-Aligned Movement must reiterate its consistent position of principle that force of arms and unilateral actions should not in any way affect the solution of the problem. To this end, our Movement will, I hope, concert action for the revocation of the unilateral declaration and the immediate resumption of intercommunal talks on the basis of the high-level agreements of 1977 and 1979. The Movement should unitedly back the efforts of the United Nations Sec-

retary-General to ensure respect for the unified status of the Republic of Cyprus."

69. The Government of India deplores the latest actions taken in contravention of Council resolution 541 (1983), in particular the decision involving the exchange of so-called ambassadors between Turkey and the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. We believe that this causes a serious setback to the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote a negotiated settlement. We urge that these latest actions be rescinded immediately.

70. If I may revert to the report of the Secretary-General to the Council, he has, as I noted a while ago, declared that in the present situation, "One important requirement would seem to be the maintenance of a continued process of communication and negotiation." We are in complete agreement with this assessment. We continue to believe that the mission of good offices entrusted to the Secretary-General remains the only possible channel through which the two sides could be engaged in meaningful negotiations. In spite of the obvious frustrations and disappointments that have been strewn in his path, the Secretary-General has been good enough to indicate that he is prepared to continue to discharge his mission of good offices as long as there is unambiguous support for it. We believe that the Secretary-General should be requested to persist in his admirable efforts. It would only be appropriate, therefore, for the Council to strengthen his hand. In particular, all States which have influence in the region have a special responsibility, and they should give the Secretary-General active support and reinforce his efforts. They must display greater determination than they have been willing to display so far to ensure that resolution 541 (1983) is respected and implemented.

71. We are under no illusions about the vexed nature of the question of Cyprus, which has now been rendered even more difficult and complicated by recent events. However, the most important challenge before the Council today is checking the drift towards a state of hopelessness. The present intolerable situation must be reversed and a meaningful dialogue resumed.

72. The Government and people of India are bound to the Government and people of the Republic of Cyprus by deep ties of friendship and co-operation. Cyprus, like India, is a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement. All of us in the Movement are firmly committed to lending our full support to the sovereignty, independence, unity, territorial integrity and non-alignment of that friendly country. This is also the objective of the United Nations, and it is the solemn duty of the Security Council to take resolute action in pursuance of that objective. We trust that the Council will find it possible to do so.

73. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Russian*]: The representative of Cyprus wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him.

74. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): The distortions and outright falsehoods of the Turkish side compel my delegation to exercise its right of reply even though those falsehoods have been repeatedly and fully exposed in past meetings of this Council.

75. As in the past, I consider the statement made by the individual who has appeared under rule 39 as having been made by the Turkish representative, for he who does things through others does them himself. The Turkish fabrications remind me of the saying of a great American President: "You can fool all of the people some of the time, and you can fool some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

76. The gist of Turkey's policy in Cyprus and the statements heard today in the Council—both of them—is indeed a cynical attempt to fool all of the people all of the time. First let me say that I consider it to be the apotheosis of the absurd when the aggressor, Turkey, the usurper of our homes and lands and the occupier of almost 40 per cent of our territory, accuses its victim of usurpation. To which "usurpation" does the Turkish representative refer? To the usurpation of the country? We are in Cyprus and we shall remain there because we belong there. It is the ancestral home and land for all Cypriots—Greeks, Turks, Armenians, Maronites and Latins. It has been so for centuries. Turkey is the alien and undesirable element in Cyprus. Its presence there, by the Turkish Prime Minister's own admission, is based on expansionist reasons and is intended to safeguard Turkey's security. Imagine, a half million Cypriots constituting a threat to the 45 million Turks.

77. We are here in the Council because we are the sole, legitimate Government of Cyprus. We are a democratic Government at that. We are here because we are duly recognized by the whole world: all nations, all international forums and, gratefully, not by the aggressor, Turkey. Our governmental system is free and not a parody of democracy as is that of the representative of Turkey. We did not expel anyone—least of all any Turkish Cypriot officials—from the Government. The Turkish Cypriot ministers and other Government officials are not, regrettably, at present in the Government. That is not of our own doing or by choice on our part, but because of harassment and intimidation by the aggressor so as to undermine and cause the collapse of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. There are still, however, a few courageous Turkish Cypriots who defied Turkey and remained in their posts. I repeat —and this is the gist of the issue—they were not expelled; they were forced by Turkey to abandon their Government posts by threats to their lives. As a matter of fact, we yearn and struggle for their return. The members of the Turkish Cypriot community were never, and are not today, considered by us as second-class citizens. Our sense of fairness and pride—healthy pride, not like the one invoked by the representative of Turkey, whose pride is directed only towards the violation of resolutions—would not allow it. We repeat that

the Turkish Cypriot community constitutes a precious and inseparable part of the people of our country, and that is how it has been treated. Should our community be let free the world will stand witness to one of the most moving scenes of reunion among countrymen with a common destiny and country.

78. The Turkish representative repeated a number of allegations. Let me start with his reference to the problem itself, the invasion and occupation of Cyprus. Turkey used many pretexts for that act of aggression, which left 5,000 dead and about 1,600 missing and rendered 200,000 Cypriots refugees in their own country. The dimensions of the refugee situation in Cyprus are staggering. Comparatively speaking, they would equate to 85 million refugees in the USSR, 80 million in the United States, 20 million in the United Kingdom, 20 million in France and about 300 million in China. Of course, we heard this morning that there is no crisis in Cyprus.

79. At the time of the invasion Turkey told the world that "a peace operation", as it called it, was prompted by the need to provide security for the Turkish Cypriot community, which, by the way, was neither threatened nor involved in the *coup* and fighting that ensued. Then Turkey, through the mouth of none other than Mr. Günes, the Foreign Minister at the time of the invasion, changed its tune and said on 20 July 1980: "Cyprus is valuable as a right arm for a country interested in its defence and for expansionist aims." "There are those", he continued, "who wish to see the invasion of Cyprus as merely a desire to protect the Turkish Cypriots in the island, whereas the actual problem is the security of the 45 million Turks in their motherland." The words are his.

80. Cyprus is important to Turkey and to any country that harbours expansionist aims. Here in a nutshell is the cause of our tragedy: our strategic importance, which has been a curse for our people. As if confirmation of this fact were necessary, Turkish Prime Minister Ozal's statement of 30 November 1983, published in *The Christian Science Monitor*, that "Cyprus is a dagger stuck in the belly of Turkey" updates and reconfirms the expansionist aims of Turkey with regard to Cyprus. This Turkish lie was thus exposed.

81. The argument that Turkey acted in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee also falls flat on its face because, as is well known, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations prohibits the use of force in international relations. The word "action" stipulated in article 4 of the Treaty of Guarantee cannot be interpreted to mean military action. If it were so, the Treaty would be contrary to the provisions of the Charter and would thus be null and void *ab initio* as per Charter Article 103, which states that obligations under the Charter shall prevail over the obligations of a State under any other agreement.

82. Then it was the Turkish allegation that the aggression was justified in order to re-establish the *status quo*. But years after the return of the democratically elected President of the Republic of Cyprus and of constitutionality to Cyprus, the Turkish occupation troops remain in Cyprus as living evidence of contempt for United Nations resolutions demanding their withdrawal and of Ankara's conviction that the bigger the lie the better the chances of its being accepted.

83. Time and again Turkey has appeared before this forum telling the world community that what it is doing in Cyprus is not designed to partition the island. But the grim record belies the Turkish allegation. This abominable record of Ankara's actions in Cyprus has been fully documented by my President in his statement to the Council. Need I recount the mass expulsions of Cypriots, the colonization of their homes and lands, the further series of further aggressive actions and illegalities, culminating in the secessionist declaration of 15 November 1983 and the recent exchange of "ambassadors" between the culprit and its offspring? Need I refer to the adoption of a flag, to the setting up of a hand-picked "Constituent Assembly" and to the announced decisions for a so-called constitutional referendum and elections?

84. Suffice it to say that the move for a unilateral declaration of independence, condemned by the whole world, made the Government of Turkey look ridiculous, for it will be recalled that when Turkey invaded Cyprus in 1974 it stated quite clearly that it was intervening to restore the independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus. Thus actions spoke louder than words.

85. As a result, we have today a secessionist and illegal entity set up through the barbarity of uprooting the indigenous people, one which is using the Turkish lira, has been integrated into the postal service of Turkey and is running on Turkish time and on water and electricity freely—I repeat, freely—supplied for years by the Government of Cyprus—even after the secession, notwithstanding what members of the Council heard this morning.

86. Even former non-believers admit that they are confronted with an unparalleled case of international deceit. Turkey is now openly and notoriously a renowned international outlaw. But the actions to dismember a small State under the boot of the aggressor are still going on. The so-called elections, a luxury which Mr. Denktaş has been so anxiously demanding of his masters in Ankara in order to maintain himself as so-called President in the occupied areas, are still to come.

87. Elections presuppose a free democratic process. Elections cannot be held under the boots and bayonets of the occupation forces. Elections presuppose territory. Where is that territory? Is it the territory usurped and robbed from its rightful owners, the territory which under international law remains under the sovereignty of the Republic of Cyprus, as is indisputably recognized by international law and confirmed by United Nations

resolutions? Which people will participate? The Anatolian settlers who were brought into Cyprus by the thousands by Turkey after the indigenous population was forcibly uprooted in order to change the demographic character of the island?

88. On this heinous crime of importing settlers, Turkey again gave a series of contradictory answers to the serious charges against it. First, it described them as seasonal workers. When confronted with the question as to how a region with 25 per cent unemployment could be importing labour, it changed its version and added another lie that the settlers were Turkish Cypriots returning to the island. But when again Turkey was confronted with the cold facts, the migration statistics taken by the United Kingdom during the colonial years which proved the Turkish answer utterly false—unless, of course, we were dealing with rabbits—Turkey, like a snail, withdrew into its shell, brushing away any question on this subject with the ridiculous reply that the question of settlers was an internal matter of its puppet régime.

89. Unprecedented in criminality are the illegalities being committed against the Republic of Cyprus: aggression, invasion, occupation, dismemberment of its territory, uprooting of its people and steps to change its demographic character. All these directly affect Cyprus. But this body and the world organization in general are also being victimized and subjected by Turkey to contemptuous treatment. Its decisions are flouted, its resolutions scorned, its edicts torn up by a country with a history of oppression and continuing regressive policies.

90. Reference was made to discrimination against the Turkish Cypriots at the hands of my Government. That is another ludicrous attempt to mislead the world community, for when 18 per cent of the population is given 30 per cent of Government posts, when that 18 per cent has 40 per cent of the police and security posts, as the Turkish community had under the 1960 Constitution, it is strange—indeed, an outright lie—to brand the Government of Cyprus as discriminating against or suppressing the Turkish Cypriot community.

91. The Turkish representative referred to the 1954 to 1974 era. The history of Cyprus is centuries old. But like an amateur surgeon, Mr. Denktaş singled out 20 years of some scattered intercommunal incidents and discarded five centuries of continuous peaceful and friendly relations between our Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. He sought, as always, to create the image of a threatened Turkish Cypriot community, and upon this propaganda he purports to justify his destructive policies, cultivates fear and hate, speaks of graves, warns of non-existent dangers and promulgates division. Whenever cornered, he regurgitates the fear of *enosis*, knowing full well that in 1979 and 1981 the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus by unanimous resolutions ruled out both *enosis* and partition. There is also the 1979 high-level agreement which excludes both *enosis* and partition.

92. Why did the Turkish side mention it? The answer is obvious: in order to mislead the Council, since the Turkish policies are not and cannot be based on truth, moral principles, the Charter, international law and United Nations resolutions. They cannot justify their actions of segregation, partition and division in the enlightened world of the twentieth century. They cannot justify their bantustanization policies. They cannot, I repeat, justify their Ian Smith policy of so-called equality in partnership, meaning that the 18 per cent equals 82 per cent. They cannot justify it, because this theory is unnatural, regressive and unjust. This diatribe was rejected by the people of the country then called Southern Rhodesia. The rejection was also world-wide and absolute. We proudly see today the representative of Zimbabwe, a country which tasted the trials of a unilateral declaration of independence, occupying a seat in the Security Council without the vicissitudes of so-called equality in partnership.

93. The Turkish representative spoke about his favourite subjects, ones he holds close and dear: the alleged intercommunal strife and the so-called suffering of the Turkish Cypriot community. Yes, there were some staged intermittent clashes instigated from outside. Yes, lives were lost—some Greek Cypriot and some Turkish Cypriot. Yes, they occurred during the colonial years and again in 1964 and 1967, when Cyprus was independent. They were instigated and orchestrated by Turkey, a tactic reminiscent of the methods of those who intentionally set fire to someone else's home in order to have a pretext to enter the house and steal his belongings.

94. But beyond the causes of the clashes, is there any Member State in this forum which has not had internal unrest? Is there any State Member of the United Nations or the world community which has not experienced this sad development? I believe there is none. Must we, as a result of internal clashes, justify invasion by a third country, indiscriminate napalm bombing of defenceless civilians, occupation, uprooting of people, colonization of the occupied areas by settlers and the unilateral declaration of independence? I say no.

95. In this very chamber sit the representatives of countries which went through communal strife; thousands upon thousands were the victims, billions upon billions the destruction to property. Should those countries have been dissected?

96. What about the hardships of the Turkish Cypriot community, to which they refer? Why did the Turkish Cypriot community suffer? It was because of Turkey's policies of separation and division, which forcibly segregated, and still segregate, the Turkish Cypriot community from the trunk of the economic and social progress of our people. The words of the sagacious Secretary-General U Thant, the highest independent authority on the question of Cyprus, are again to the point. They were cogently referred to this morning by President Kyprianou, and I shall quote them only in

part: "the hardships suffered by the Turkish Cypriot population are the direct result of the leadership's self-isolation, imposed by force on the rank and file" [*see S/6426, para. 106*].

97. What is the record of Turkey on human rights, on which it capitalizes with such hypocrisy? Turkey now stands accused in the Council of Europe for violations of the human rights of its own people in its own territory, while it has already been tried, convicted and condemned for systematic, hair-raising, mass human rights violations in Cyprus. What about Turkey and the annihilation of millions of people of other ethnic backgrounds? This is the country which invaded Cyprus to "liberate", and "protect the human rights" of, the Turkish Cypriot community.

98. Turkey complained of "bias" in the Security Council. A host of resolutions and decisions have been adopted in the United Nations on the question of Cyprus. All of them, without exception, vindicate our positions and condemn Turkey. We are not a super-Power; we are not even a Power in the military sense. We have no war machine, nor can we blackmail or intimidate. We rely solely on the merits of our case and on the provisions of the Charter, which we have consistently and faithfully observed. There lies our strength, and upon that strength we carry on, half free and half occupied.

99. Turkey, on the other hand, follows the policy of the big lie. That deceitful policy, and the Turkish expansionism, pursued through division and partition, were and are at the root of the problem of Cyprus. Instead of unity, Turkey pursues division; instead of integration it dictates segregation; and instead of equality before the law it tries to impose privilege and discriminatory arrangements based on ethnic criteria, the latter distorting the principle of equality and thus shaking the roots of peaceful coexistence. Such inequalities strike at the roots of the balance which exists in federal systems and which Turkey so hypocritically proclaims that it supports as a solution.

100. All along, the concern of Ankara has not been the protection or promotion of the Turkish Cypriots at all, but rather their use—or misuse—in order to promote its own aims of partition. In an interdependent world, in a United Nations era, where the obvious and compelling need is for unity if mankind is to survive, the Turkish policy in Cyprus is one of regressive division, bantustanization and outright *apartheid*.

101. Reference was made to the high-level meetings and to the talks. It should not escape the attention of any member of the Council that every time the Turkish side resorts to a unilateral action against the Republic of Cyprus it immediately rallies its resources towards securing efforts by independent authorities aimed at talks and high-level meetings, only to use them to neutralize world condemnation and the international outcry against its illegal actions, and to buy time for its next annexationist step. I remind the Council that this is particularly true in the case of the latest crimes against Cyprus and its people as a whole, namely the purported secession from and dismemberment of the Republic and the so-called exchange of ambassadors.

102. I remind members specifically that in November 1983, while the representative of the Secretary-General was in Cyprus to hand Mr. Denktaş the scenario for a high-level meeting which he himself had requested and which had been accepted by my President, the unilateral declaration of independence was proclaimed. The same pattern was followed this year; the scheme to deceive continues.

103. It was indeed with deep regret that we heard today the insulting and disgraceful accusations made by Mr. Denktaş against a statesman, Mr. Galo Plaza, who has served as the United Nations mediator in Cyprus. Mr. Galo Plaza is internationally recognized as a man of dignity and of high moral standard. He pursued his high mission with great devotion and dedication to the principles of the United Nations. Mr. Galo Plaza studied the Cyprus problem in depth and came to the conclusion that partition would ultimately destroy Cyprus. Such a conclusion, of course, did not please Turkey, which all along had aimed at the partition of Cyprus. They rejected Mr. Galo Plaza's proposals outright, unlike the Government of Cyprus, which immediately accepted them. We are now witnessing an attempt by the agent of Turkey to smear the reputation of the United Nations and its representatives. I hope that members will take due note of the seriousness of this matter and of the ulterior motives behind this attitude. The attempt of Mr. Denktaş to falsify the record on the acceptance of Mr. Galo Plaza's proposals by the Government of Cyprus does not impress me in the least; I believe that, by now, he is in no position to mislead the members of the Security Council.

104. The time has come for the Council to send the right signal to Ankara—indeed, to all potential aggressors. The Charter of the United Nations is quite explicit about the measures to be taken.

105. Ten years ago the Council unanimously found Turkey guilty of aggression and of the occupation of almost 40 per cent of the territory of Cyprus. It has by now, I am sure, reached the conclusion that the perpetrator of those crimes is unrepentant and that stronger measures, as provided for in the Charter, are long overdue in order to force Turkey to cease and desist its continuing and ever-escalating aggressive actions against Cyprus and its people.

106. We look to the Council confidently, relaying to it the agonizing plea of the vanquished, but not defeated, people of Cyprus, who are crying out for justice and vindication, and are seeking from the Council remedy and redress. With an indomitable spirit the people of Cyprus look to the Council and expect action. They expect a verdict based on international law and the indelible principles of justice and international morality; a verdict based on the Council's own resolutions.

Can the Council afford to let them down? Or, if I may paraphrase, can the Security Council afford to let itself down? I confidently trust that the answer will be a resounding "no".

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, vol. II, 68th meeting, para. 11.

[2] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 382, No. 5475.

[3] *Conference on Cyprus: Documents signed and initialled at Lancaster House on 19 February 1959*, Cmnd. 679 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1959).

[4] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XXVIII, No. 701.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61313—January 1993—2,050